1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA * * * 6 7 MIGUEL ALVAREZ, et al., Case No. 2:23-CV-473 JCM (DJA) 8 Plaintiff(s), **ORDER** 9 v. 10 LOREN K. MILLER, et al., 11 Defendant(s). 12 13 Presently before the court is the defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiffs' complaint. 14 (ECF No. 13). Plaintiffs have not filed a response, and the time to do so has now passed. 15 Plaintiffs are prospective visa applicants who allege that their applications have been 16 pending for an unreasonable amount of time. They seek adjudication of those applications, and, 17 ultimately, permission to remain in the United States. 18 Pursuant to District of Nevada Local Rule 7-2(d), "the failure of an opposing party to file 19 points and authorities in response to any motion ... constitutes a consent to the granting of the 20 motion." LR 7-2(d); see Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) ("Failure to follow a 21 district court's local rules is a proper ground for dismissal."). 22 However, the court will not automatically grant every unopposed motion. First, the court 23 must weigh the following factors: "(1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; 24 (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the 25 public policy favoring disposition of cases of their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic 26 sanctions." *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53. 27 Having considered defendant's motion and plaintiff's amended complaint in light of the 28 Ghazali factors, the court grants the motion. The first three factors—the public's interest in

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge

Case 2:23-cv-00473-JCM-DJA Document 15 Filed 06/21/23 Page 2 of 2

expeditiously resolving this litigation, the court's interest in managing the docket, and the risk of prejudice to defendants—all weigh in favor of dismissal. See id.; Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976) (holding that a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in dismissal). Therefore, dismissal is appropriate Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that defendant's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 13) be, and the same hereby is, GRANTED. The clerk is instructed to close this case. DATED June 21, 2023.

James C. Mahan U.S. District Judge